

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-39 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-39. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of pending claims 1-39.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 16, 18-24, 26-28, 33, 35 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Bayer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,190). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As to claim 1, Applicant has amended claim 1. Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 1 as it stood before amendment. Applicant further submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "generating a database identifying a plurality of eligible voters, the database including an email address and an indication of the number of voters for each eligible voter." Therefore, Applicant submits claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

As to claims 2 and 19, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claims 2 and 19 as they stood before claim 1, from which claim 2 depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 2 and 19 are also in condition for allowance.

As to claims 3 and 20, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claims 3 and 20 as they stood before claim 1, from which claim 3 depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 3 and 20 are also in condition for allowance.

As to claims 5 and 24, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claims 5 and 24 as they stood before claim 1, from which claim 5 depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 5 and 24 are in condition for allowance.

As to claims 7 and 26, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claims 7 and 26, as they stood before claim 1, from which claim 7 depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 7 and 26 are also in condition for allowance.

As to claims 9 and 27, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claims 9 and 27, as they stood before claim 1, from which claim 9 depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 9 and 27 are also in condition for allowance.

As to claim 10, Applicant has presented arguments of the allowability of claim 1, from which claim 10 depends, before claim 1 was amended. Applicant submits claim 1, as amended, is in condition for allowance.. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 10 is also in condition for allowance.

As to claims 16 and 33, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claims 16 and 33, as they stood before claim 1, from which claim 16 depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 16 and 33 are in condition for allowance.

As to claim 18, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claim 18. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 18 is in condition for allowance.

As to claim 21, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claim 21. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 21 is in condition for allowance.

As to claim 22, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claim 22. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 22 is in condition for allowance.

As to claim 23, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claim 23. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 23 is in condition for allowance.

As to claim 28, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claim 28. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 28 is in condition for allowance.

As to claim 35, Applicant has amended claim 35. Applicant has presented arguments for the allowability of claim 35 as it stood before amendment. Applicant further submits the cited portions of the cited reference fail to disclose "securely transferring the voting result in electronic form to an agent system." Therefore, Applicant submits claim 35 is in condition for allowance.

As to claim 36, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claim 36 as it stood before claim 35, from which claim 36 depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 36 is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 6, 8, 11-15, 17, 24, 25, 29-32, and 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bayer et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As to claim 4, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claim 4 as it stood before claim 1, from which claim 4 depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 4 is in condition for allowance.

As to claims 6, 17, 25, and 34, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claims 6, 17, 25, and 34 before claim 1, from which claims 6 and 17 indirectly depend, were amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 6, 17, 25, and 34 are in condition for allowance.

As to claim 8, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claim 8 before claim 1, from which claim 8 indirectly depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 8 is in condition for allowance.

As to claims 11 and 29, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claims 11 and 29 before claim 1, from which claim 11 indirectly depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 11 and 29 are in condition for allowance.

As to claims 12 and 30, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claims 12 and 30 before claim 1, from which claim 12 indirectly depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 12 and 30 are in condition for allowance.

As to claims 13 and 31, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claims 13 and 31 before claim 1, from which claim 13 indirectly depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 13 and 31 are in condition for allowance.

As to claims 14 and 32, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claims 14 and 32 before claim 1, from which claim 14 indirectly depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 14 and 32 are in condition for allowance.

As to claim 15, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claim 15 before claim 1, from which claim 15 indirectly depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 15 is in condition for allowance.

As to claim 37, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claim 37 before claim 35, from which claim 37 depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 37 is in condition for allowance.


As to claim 38, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claim 38 before claim 35, from which claim 38 indirectly depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 38 is in condition for allowance.

As to claim 39, Applicant has submitted arguments for the allowability of claim 39 before claim 35, from which claim 39 indirectly depends, was amended. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 39 is in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome all of the Office's rejections, and early notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

11/07/2008  
Date

  
Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.  
PO Box 164075  
Austin, Texas 78716-4075  
(512) 347-9223 (phone)  
(512) 347-9224 (fax)